IN THE CLAIMS

Please amend the claims as follows:

1. (original) A method of handling capacity bottlenecks in digital networks (5), particularly digital home networks, in which at least two appliances or applications (1a, 1b, 1c) with public interfaces for influencing the internal resource allocation in a system have access to the resources of a data transfer medium having a non-constant bandwidth, wherein, in the case of a resource bottleneck, the data transfer rate of that data stream is reduced whose effect on the associated application is noticed by the user least.

2. (original) A method as claimed in claim 1, characterized in that, for selecting the data stream to be reduced, a priority for each stream is regularly determined from information on the context of the users and on the contents of all streams.

3. (original) A method as claimed in claim 2, characterized in that the transmitting network (5) is notified about the determined priority (10) for each stream.

4. (original) A method as claimed in claim 2, characterized in that the different applications (1a, 1b, 1c) are notified about the determined priority (10) for each stream which is either directly processed by themselves or passed on to the network (5).

5. (currently amended) A method as claimed in claim 3 ~~or 4~~, characterized in that one priority (10) for each transmission band is allocated to scalable data streams.

6. (currently amended) A method as claimed in ~~any one of claims 2 to 5~~claim 2, characterized in that, in case of an occurring resource bottleneck, the data streams having the lowest priority are the first to be reduced in quality or to be aborted completely.

7. (currently amended) A method as claimed in ~~any one of claims 1 to 6~~claim 1, characterized in that the applications (1a, 1b, 1c) within the system transmit their quality requirements in combination with their connection requirements.

8. (currently amended) A method as claimed in ~~any one of claims 1 to 7~~claim 1, characterized in that quality requirements of the applications (1a, 1b, 1c) are defined by the system itself from default entries.

9. (currently amended) A method as claimed in ~~any one of claims 1 to 8~~ claim 1, characterized in that the user is enabled to ~~can~~ deny a quality limitation of the system.

10. (original) A method as claimed in claim 9, characterized in that, after denial of a quality limitation, the system determines the next best priority (10) and notifies the network (5) or the applications (1a, 1b, 1c) about it.

11. (currently amended) A method as claimed in claim 9 ~~or 10~~, characterized in that user denials are stored by the system and are taken into account when determining future priority (10) computations.